

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 25, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ribas-Corbera et al (US 2002/0122598) in view of Itawaki et al (US 2002/0085584). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art reference or references, when combined, must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. With respect to independent claim 25, Applicants respectfully submit that both Ribas-Corbera and Itawaki fail to teach or suggest “accessing an inventory of multiple layers of compressed data generated **based on an energy distribution of the quantized transform coefficients.**” The Examiner indicates that Ribas-Corbera in Figures 4 and 5 teaches an encoding method for generating compressed data based on quantized transform coefficients of the data, the method comprising: accessing an inventory of blocks/layers ordered from smallest energy to largest energy of the quantized transform coefficients; and, extracting with the use of an encoder a selected number of layers/blocks to generate the compressed data. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In Ribas-Corbera, Figure 4 is a step diagram showing how block skipping is performed and Figure 5 is a block diagram showing how block skipping is incorporated into the encoder. It is clear from Figure 5 that the block skipping algorithm described by Ribas-Corbera operates on pixels in the spatial domain and that all energy calculations are performed on blocks of pixels prior to transform by the block transform (16), and prior to quantization by the block quantizer (18). Thus, Ribas-Corbera teaches away from the claimed element of “accessing an inventory of multiple layers of compressed data generated **based on an energy distribution of the quantized transform coefficients.**” Itawaki adds nothing with respect to this element. Thus, claim 25 should be in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 27 and 29 both contain limitations that include “accessing an inventory of multiple layers of compressed data generated **based on an energy distribution of the quantized transform coefficients.**” As discussed above, Ribas-Corbera teaches away from this and Itawaki adds nothing with respect to this element. These claims should also be allowable.

Claims 1, 12, 22 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al (US 6,480,547) in view of Ribas-Corbera et al (US 2002/0122598). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that both Chen and Ribas-Corbera fail to teach or suggest “generating an energy distribution of the quantized transform coefficients” and “grouping the transform coefficients into layers based on the energy distribution.” The Examiner indicates that Chen et al teach in Figure 4 a data compression method comprising: generating transform coefficients from input data using a Discrete Cosine Transform (414); quantizing the transform coefficients using a quantizer (416); grouping the transform coefficients into layers; and entropy coding layers of the data coefficients using an entropy coder (418). Applicants respectfully disagree.

In Chen, Figure 4 illustrates an exemplary fine granular scalability (FGS) encoder. The FGS encoder is comprised of a base layer encoding unit (410) and an enhancement layer encoding unit (450). The base layer encoding unit (410) and the enhancement layer encoding unit (450) do not generate an energy distribution of quantized transform coefficients. Furthermore, the base layer encoding unit (410) and the enhancement layer encoding unit (450) do not group transform coefficients into layers based on the energy distribution of the coefficients. Accordingly, independent claim 1 should be allowable. Ribas-Corbera adds nothing with respect to this element.

Independent claims 12, 22, and 31 contain similar limitations to independent claim 1 and should also be allowable.

Regarding dependent claims 2-11, they depend from independent claim 1, which is believed to be patentable, and thus dependent claims 2-11 should also be patentable.

Regarding dependent claims 13-21, they depend from independent claim 12, which is believed to be patentable, and thus dependent claims 13-21 should also be patentable.

Regarding dependent claims 23 and 24, they depend from independent claim 22, which is believed to be patentable, and thus dependent claims 23 and 24 should also be patentable.

Regarding dependent claims 32-41, they depend from independent claim 31, which is believed to be patentable, and thus dependent claims 32-41 should also be patentable.

Regarding dependent claim 26, it depends from independent claim 25, which is believed to be patentable, and thus dependent claim 26 should also be patentable.

Regarding dependent claim 28, it depends from independent claim 27, which is believed to be patentable, and thus dependent claim 28 should also be patentable.

Regarding dependent claim 30, it depends from independent claim 29, which is believed to be patentable, and thus dependent claim 30 should also be patentable.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-41 are presently standing in this patent application. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, each and every point raised in the Office Action mailed September 24, 2007 has been addressed on the basis of the above remarks. Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in this patent application to be in a condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested. However, should the Examiner believe that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of this patent application; the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number given below.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 20, 2007

By: \Steven Thiel\ for
Timothy Buckley, Reg. No. 55,028
858.845-3519

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502